THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
DECEMBER 12, 2008, IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: President Knapp, Executive Vice President Lehman, Registrar Amundson, Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Barratt, Dolling, and Phillips; Professors Castleberry, Cordes, Corry, Costanza, Galston, Garris, Griffith, Harrington, Helgert, Johnson, Lipscomb, Marotta, Miller, Pagel, Parsons, Plack, Robinson, Simon, Wilmarth, and Wirtz

Absent: Deans Brown, Burke, Futrell, Lawrence, Reum, and Scott; Professors Artz, Becker, Benton-Short, Biles, Englander, Hotez, Rycroft, and Windsor

The meeting was called to order by President Knapp at 2:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Professor Griffith noted that his remarks and Vice President Lehman's response appeared twice in the minutes, and he requested that the segment under Brief Statements and Questions be deleted. The minutes were approved as amended.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

RESPONSE OF EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND TREASURER LOUIS H. KATZ TO QUESTIONS BASED ON REPORTS PRESENTED AT THE NOVEMBER 14, 2008 SENATE MEETING CONCERNING THE PROPOSED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING COMPLEX

Executive Vice President Katz stated that he would answer the questions about the Science and Engineering Complex in the order they had been submitted. The text of the questions is reproduced below, followed by Executive Vice President Katz's responses.

1. In its report to the Faculty Senate on November 14, 2008, the Senate Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee (FPBC) presented (on pages 9-12) an "Illustration" of cost and financing issues related to the Science and Engineering Complex ("SEC"). The Illustration assumed construction costs of approximately $250 million for the SEC. The Illustration also assumed that those construction costs would have a budgetary impact of $18 million per year if they were financed by 30-year, fixed-rate debt with an interest rate of 6% per year. The Illustration further assumed maintenance costs of $6.3 million per year, resulting in a total budgetary impact of $24.3 million per year for construction and maintenance costs.

 Based on the information currently available to the University, are the foregoing figures consistent with a reasonable preliminary "ballpark estimate" of (i) the

anticipated construction and maintenance costs for the SEC and (ii) the potential budgetary impact of those costs?

Vice President Katz said that he agreed that the estimates presented in the "Illustration" contained in the report of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee were reasonable estimates at this stage for planning purposes. While there are many variables that will need to be taken into consideration as the planning moves forward, adjustments can be made to the Illustration presented by Professor Cordes, as the purpose of the Illustration is to provide a model that can be updated as more information becomes available.

2. President Knapp has previously stated that the principal sources of funding for the SEC will be (i) revenues from Square 54, (ii) indirect cost recoveries from sponsored research conducted at the SEC, and (iii) contributions from donors. President Knapp has also stated that the University will not finance the SEC by using tuition revenues from programs that are not designated for inclusion in the SEC.

 Please confirm that the foregoing statements are consistent with the University's plans for financing the SEC.

Vice President Katz responded in the affirmative, confirming that the President's statements were consistent with the University's plan for financing the facility.

3. With regard to the first source of funding, the FPBC's report stated that the stream of revenues from Square 54 has been capitalized at $162 million and has been added to the University's endowment. The FPBC's Illustration assumed a 4.4% annual payout from that capitalized figure, resulting in annual funding of $7.1 million for the SEC from Square 54.

 Is it correct that an amount less than the full cash flow income from Square 54 will be devoted to funding the SEC? If so, is the $7.1 million figure a reasonable estimate of the funding that will be provided by Square 54 for the SEC? In that case, how does the University intend to use the additional annual cash flow income from Square 54 (approximately $2 million per year)?

Vice President Katz confirmed that the value of the lease payments over 60 years from Square 54 development were capitalized and placed in the University's endowment with an appraised value of $162 million. These lease payments amount to a little over $9 million annually at present and will increase over the life of the lease. The payout estimate of $7.1 million per year is based upon the assumption that the Board of Trustees will approve a payout rate from the endowment consistent with other such payouts. Any amount from the lease over and above the $7.1 million payout would be added to the endowment and reinvested, as the University does with other endowment funds.

Professor Griffith said that there had been some discussion in the past about asking the Board of Trustees to authorize a special payout to support the SEC project from the portion of the endowment represented by Square 54 lease payments. Vice President Katz responded that this has not been discussed specifically with the Board. Given the current state of financial markets and the reduced value of the endowment, Vice President Katz said he thought it unlikely that a special payout would be approved.

Professor Simon inquired about capitalization of the Square 54 lease and the difference between the prospective endowment payout of $7.1 million versus the $9 million in cash flow the University would be receiving annually from the lease. Vice President Katz responded that the value of the Square 54 lease was determined by an independent appraisal, and added that he agreed that the appraisal was reasonable. He explained that the value of the lease would be reappraised every year, just like everything else in the endowment. If the capitalization rates change next year, which is virtually certain, then the value of the lease will change. That is how financial assets are valued for endowment purposes, whether they be real estate or another investment category.

4. With regard to the second source of funding, the Illustration assumed that approximately $5 million in indirect cost recoveries will be generated each year by sponsored research at the SEC. After taking account of the assumed funding from Square 54 and indirect cost recoveries, the Illustration estimated that an annual budget gap of $10-$12 million would need to be filled if 100% of the construction and maintenance costs of the SEC are funded by long-term debt.

 Based on the information currently available to the University, is the $10-$12 million figure consistent with a reasonable preliminary "ballpark estimate" of the additional annual funding that will be needed to cover the costs of construction and maintenance for the SEC, over and above the funding provided by Square 54 and indirect cost recoveries?

Vice President Katz said again that he agreed that the FPBC Illustration was a reasonable current estimate of the "gap" that will need to be funded by sources other than Square 54 and indirect cost recoveries. Vice President Katz also said that the estimate of an increase of $5 million in indirect cost recoveries from the SEC was a fairly conservative estimate and one with which he was comfortable.

5. Does the Administration believe that sponsored research at the SEC is likely to generate annual indirect cost recoveries of $5 million or more if programs in the medical sciences are NOT included in the SEC?

 Is the Administration open to the possibility of including some or all of the basic science departments of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences within the SEC?

Vice President Katz said he thought the essence of this question was whether or not the University was open to the idea of including some of the basic science departments from the Medical Center in the SEC. He said that the administration is open to anything that makes sense for the University, that no definitive decisions have yet been made, and that he thought the administration needs to look at all of the options available.

Professor Wilmarth said he had seen the press release recently issued by the University concerning the appointment of Dr. Leo Chalupa as GW's new Vice President for Research. He quoted a passage from that press release, dated December 8, 2008, which said that "[o]ne of Dr. Chalupa's primary responsibilities will be to increase collaboration between the academic and medical areas of the University, which will help to strengthen the development of research across all disciplines." Professor Wilmarth said that if one of the University's goals is to increase collaboration in research between the academic and

medical areas, he was doubtful whether this would occur if the basic science departments of the Medical Center are excluded from the SEC. While the configuration of the SEC has not yet been finalized, the Administration has previously informed the Senate that it is very unlikely that the basic science departments in the Medical Center would be included in the SEC. Vice President Lehman said he thought there are two issues involved. The first is that of departmental offices being located in the SEC, as opposed to laboratory space being allocated for projects that have to do with research in the basic biomedical, or even clinical sciences. There is already a significant amount of collaboration underway between the Medical Center, the Engineering School, and the science departments of the Columbian College, and the University wants to see this interdisciplinary collaboration grow. At this point, the University wants to follow the model utilized at most universities, which provides for laboratory space to be assigned competitively based on the funding level of the principal investigators who are proposing to occupy the space. Furthering this interdisciplinary collaboration can be brought about without necessarily moving a full department into the SEC.

6. The Illustration assumed that the estimated annual budget gap of $10-$12 million could be closed if the University raised $100 million in contributions for the SEC, thereby reducing the amount of required debt financing for the SEC from $250 million to $150 million.

 Based on the information currently available to the University, does the Administration believe it is feasible to raise $100 million in contributions for the SEC? If the University is unable to raise the amount needed to close the annual budget gap, how does the Administration intend to address the problem?

Vice President Katz observed that the University is in the planning stage of an overall capital campaign, and that the administration believes that the estimate of $100 million is achievable and a reasonable estimate of funds needed for the building. This figure does not include funding for programs in the building, as the administration has emphasized. As to what would happen if this amount were not raised, there are many options. One example would be building the entire envelope of the facility with portions of the interior of the building remaining unfinished until financing is available.

Professor Griffith asked what would happen if the fundraising campaign does not work at all. He asked if the University could envision spending $12 million annually to cover the projected funding gap in addition to the University's current annual debt service payments of approximately $52 million. Vice President Katz responded that there are multiple parts to the answer. As an institution, GW has the overall debt capacity to do this, but that does not mean that it should or that it will. The overall goal is not just to build the building, but to improve facilities for the sciences and engineering and increase overall research capacity. Funding will have to be provided for more than just the building if this is to occur.

Vice President for Development Laurel Price Jones said that it is highly unlikely that Professor Griffith's scenario, where no money was raised, would come about. In fact, some funding for the SEC has already been secured. She pointed out that to the extent fundraising is successful, this frees up funds the University might otherwise not have available. Discussion followed between Vice President Price Jones, Professor Griffith and Professor Parsons. President Knapp observed that the University contributes the same

amount as its competitor institutions to student financial aid using general funds from tuition revenue. However, GW's endowment is not as large as those of institutions with which it compares itself. If fundraising for student financial aid is successful, this can reduce the amount drawn from tuition for such aid, and free up funds that can be devoted to other uses, such as hiring and retaining faculty and supporting programmatic initiatives.

Vice President Katz added that, given the need for enhanced science and engineering facilities, it is really more a function of when new facilities will be built rather than whether or not they will be. GW is not committed to going through with the SEC project right away no matter what happens. Many factors will come into play. The University will take into account such things as reductions in expenses that can be achieved if the SEC is built – such as reductions in some of the lease expenses that are incurred for some of the programs that are now off campus. Vice President Katz cautioned that the University is looking at a time horizon roughly three years from now before a formal commitment is made to break ground on the SEC. If the economy does not improve, it may be wise to defer the project for a time. If the economy improves and the necessary funds are raised, the University would be prepared to move forward. The overall strategy is to stay the course, continue planning during this period of time and continue to build upon the reputation and the momentum that GW has created.

7. We understand that the University's endowment recorded investment losses of approximately 3% (about $35 million) during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008. Please provide an estimate of the investment losses (if any) that the University's endowment has suffered since June 30th.

 If the University's investment losses since June 30th are substantial, do they call into question the University's ability to raise sufficient contributions to finance the construction and maintenance of the SEC without relying on tuition revenues from programs not included in the SEC?

Vice President Katz reported that the return on the endowment from January 1 through October 31, 2008 was a negative return of 19.7%. As of October 31, the amount of the endowment was approximately $1.06 billion. He estimated that the endowment suffered an additional loss of about 3% during November. While these are substantial losses, they are less than the market overall has experienced. Despite this, the University's overall liquidity on its balance sheets and operating assets is good. Unlike some other institutions, GW has not invested in highly leveraged illiquid investments

8. We understand that the Administration intends to ask the Board of Trustees next February for approval to undertake preliminary site and design planning work for the SEC. How much is the University likely to spend for such planning work and any related zoning work? Will the costs of such work be fully covered by revenues generated by Square 54?

Vice President Katz confirmed that the Board would be asked to approve the preliminary site and design planning work for the SEC. The costs of this planning work will be pre-funded by the general liquidity of the University rather than from a special endowment payout based on revenue from Square 54. If the SEC project goes forward, these expenses will become part of the construction costs of the building; if the building is

not constructed, these outlays would have to be expensed. Vice President Katz also confirmed that anticipated planning costs will amount to approximately $10 million, as previously indicated.

9. The Board of Trustees has already approved design planning work for a new building for the School of Public Health and Health Services. We also understand that planning for a project to renovate or replace Ross Hall will soon go forward.

 How does the University intend to pay for the costs for these projects while also covering the projected construction and maintenance costs of the SEC?

Vice President Katz responded that $3 million in planning dollars to design a building on the Warwick Building site for the School of Public Health Services (SPHHS) has been included in the capital budget for the Medical Center this year. The next step in the planning process for a building for SPHHS will be a report to the Board of Trustees on the details – what the building would include, how much it would cost, and how it would be paid for. In response to a question by Professor Wilmarth about the ballpark estimate for what this new building might cost, Vice President Katz said that a lot would depend upon the outcome of the planning process, but he thought it would be somewhere in the $75 to $100 million range. Professor Wilmarth also inquired about the cost of renovations to Ross Hall (or its replacement). Vice President Katz confirmed that Ross Hall is a facility that needs to be brought up to today's standards, and he estimated the cost of renovating or replacing Ross Hall would be greater than the cost of a new building for SPHHS. In order to minimize disruption at the Ross Hall site, that project would likely be conducted in phases, which could affect costs.

10. We understand that a number of other universities have recently built science and/or engineering facilities, or are in the process of doing so. We also understand that these other universities are pursuing similar strategies, which emphasize the importance of increasing sponsored research and indirect cost recoveries.

 Does the University take the risk of entering a highly competitive and possibly saturated market if (i) the SEC is primarily focused on a sponsored research strategy and (ii) funding for the SEC depends heavily on indirect cost recoveries? Does the University have a contingency plan for making up the shortfall if the anticipated increases in indirect cost recoveries are not realized?

Vice President Katz confirmed that institutions with which GW competes are investing in new construction projects for science and for engineering. If the University does not improve its facilities, over time it will not be competitive at all in either area, much less improve its research ranking. The goal of improvement is consistent with the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, and is consistent with the view of the Faculty Senate, which in 2004 adopted a resolution setting forth priorities for academic facilities, with science and engineering ranking first.

11. Resolution 04/1, adopted by the Faculty Senate on May 7, 2004, stated that new science facilities should include teaching laboratories to meet the needs

of undergraduate and graduate students in the physical and life sciences and in engineering.

Will the Science and Engineering Complex include sufficient teaching laboratories to meet the needs of undergraduate and graduate students in the physical and life sciences and engineering? If not, how does the University intend to provide additional new teaching laboratories for undergraduate and graduate students?

Vice President Katz responded in the affirmative with respect to laboratories for graduate students -- it is anticipated that the SEC will include teaching and research laboratories in the building sufficient to meet these needs. Vice President Lehman said he thought there are two aspects to the question. Relative to graduate level education, it is anticipated that these laboratories will be filled with postdoctoral individuals and students. At the undergraduate level, the administration has always envisioned that the main floor of the building would be dedicated to undergraduate teaching. How best to design these facilities and integrate them into the areas where faculty will have their offices and laboratories will be an important part of the planning process going forward. In response to questions by Professor Griffith and Professor Parsons, Vice President Lehman said that a detailed analysis of space needs will be required, but he thought that undergraduate instruction would not be confined to the first floor of the SEC. He added that he thought the first floor of the building should certainly provide a very significant fraction of the space needed for undergraduate science education.

12. The University will lose 1,250 parking spaces when the parking garage is demolished to make room for the Science and Engineering Complex. Are we correct in understanding that the Campus Plan requires the University to replace all of those lost parking spaces?

 If so, how does the University plan to replace the lost parking spaces? How soon will they be replaced?

Vice President Katz confirmed that the University Parking Garage accommodates 1250 cars. The SEC project cannot go forward unless the University can demonstrate to the District of Columbia that it will maintain the number of parking spaces it presently has. As part of the overall 20-year Campus Plan, there are many sites available on campus where the University can build more parking facilities. The University is not planning to provide more spaces than it currently does, but parking that is eliminated must be replaced.

Vice President Katz outlined a number of options for providing new parking sites. Approximately 178 spaces will become available on G Street as part of the Square 80 residence hall project. When complete, probably in Spring of 2011, the Square 54 project will provide 362 spaces for use by the University. As part of the capital plan this year, funds are available to look at the feasibility of building parking below grade on another G Street site. This could provide potentially 200-300 spaces. Thus, over half of the spaces required by displacement of the Parking Garage spaces are currently under construction. There will also be from 200-300 parking spaces under the SEC once that project is complete.

Vice President Katz acknowledged that the University will have to take a close look at the overall parking plan during and after construction of the SEC. Two promising sites are located below ground at the Hall on Virginia Avenue and the Kennedy Center.

Professor Simon observed that the number of parking spaces made available at the Square 54 site would all be utilized by the Hospital. There is no provision for parking for patients or for faculty in the Medical Center. Vice President Katz observed that these "Hospital spaces" are presently provided in the University Parking Garage and the agreement with the Hospital requires the University to provide parking, which the University will do with the goal of ensuring that the plan makes sense for everybody. President Knapp agreed with Vice President Katz that the Hospital is well aware of the way in which the University is approaching this issue. GW is in a very early stage of designing and planning the SEC project, and identifying problems that have to be solved.

Professor Wirtz noted that Mayor Fenty is on record as attempting to discourage parking and instead move people more in the direction of some sort of mass transportation. He inquired if it was part of the University administration's long-term plan to raise parking rates sufficiently to coincide with the Mayor's plan. President Knapp said he had not heard any suggestion along those lines even though the University shares the Mayor's interest in sustainability. The bottom line is that the University has agreed with the District to replace any parking places that are taken down. Professor Wirtz said it was his understanding that a letter went out relatively recently regarding increases for a segment of GW's parking population, and his point was implied by the letter – that GW was hoping to move in the direction of being consistent with the Mayor's thrust. Vice President Katz said he thought that Professor Wirtz was referring to a letter that went out offering an incentive to individuals who car share. In fact, these individuals will not have an increase in their rates if they continue to car share.

13. <u>We understand that demolition of the parking garage will result in lost revenues of approximately $2 million per year until the lost parking spaces are replaced. Is that a reasonable ballpark estimate of the annual parking revenues that will be lost?</u>

 <u>What is the total estimated amount of parking revenues that will be lost before the 1,250 parking spaces are replaced?</u>

Vice President Katz reiterated that over half of the spaces potentially lost by demolition of the Parking Garage are already in the process of being replaced. He added that he thought that there could be some loss in revenue, but it would not be as much as $2 million.

Discussion followed between Professors Simon and Griffith and Vice President Katz about campus parking and use of parking facilities at the Kennedy Center. Following this exchange, President Knapp said he thought that it was important to continue these sorts of discussions as planning for the SEC goes forward. Unless the University identifies the resources, solves the zoning issues and space and parking problems, the project cannot proceed. The University does not presently have adequate space for the work that is being done in the sciences and engineering, and it really needs to accommodate these disciplines with space that is worthy of these endeavors. The important thing is to keep moving forward with the planning process and maintain the dialogue as this unfolds.

Professor Parsons said he hoped that the Library would not be forgotten in this effort to upgrade support for science and engineering – library offerings in these areas must be improved, as well as providing teaching and laboratory facilities. President Knapp said he thought this was a very good point and that he had always assumed that when the Faculty Senate named science facilities as the most urgent academic need, that would not be at the expense of many other improvements the University needs to make, which is why the administration is increasing its capacity to bring in resources needed across the University in a variety of areas. The Library is an absolutely essential part of GW's academic infrastructure, and ways need to be found to support it. The President said he certainly takes this point very seriously and has in fact been working with Librarian Siggins, the Deans and potential donors to bring in resources to the Library.

REPORT ON THE REACCREDITATION OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES

Dean James L. Scott presented the report on reacrreditation of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) in place of Vice President for Health Affairs John F. Williams. He began by saying that he thought it would come as no surprise to anyone that SMHS has been told that, while it remains fully accredited, it has been placed on probationary status by its accrediting agency, the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). LCME oversees all of the medical schools in the U.S., and it is made up of representation from the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) here in Washington, D.C., and in Chicago. While no U.S. medical school has ever lost its accreditation, the SMHS takes seriously the concerns of its accreditation body and views its criticisms as offering the potential for improvement in the operations of the SMHS.

Dean Scott reported that the LCME had conducted a three and a half day site visit at the SMHS in February 2008, which was the culmination of an 18 month self-study process that all schools undertake every seven years. LCME issued its decision the first week of October, and the School was placed on probationary status for a period not to exceed 24 months. LCME expressed its concerns, deemed findings, in three basic areas. The first area concerned curriculum management, finding fault with the School's phrasing of its institutional objectives in outcomes-based terms. While most of the objectives were stated in this form, not all were. This led to a further finding that the School could not prove the objectives were being used universally to measure the effectiveness of the curriculum. While the LCME was exceedingly complimentary of the performance of SMHS students in every national examination, test, and outcome of residency program and the Committee did not make findings concerning the curriculum itself, it did find that the way in which outcomes measures were written needed improvement.

Another LCME finding related to curriculum management concerns an overall structure based on a computerized system that can provide continuous feedback about the curriculum. For example, if a professor feels that a fourth year student is not particularly good at identifying a specific bacterial infection, the LCME deems it desirable for schools to be able to track every point in the curriculum where a student would have encountered this material. Again, Dean Scott said that the LCME did not offer any criticism that GW students were performing poorly or that the curriculum SMHS delivers is deficient, but a completely comprehensive process is needed to track this sort of information and obtain feedback to be used for the continuous improvement of the curriculum.

A second area of concern to the LCME was inadequate lounge space. In connection with the LCME's visit in 2001, SMHS findings were issued concerning the condition of hospital facilities, the shrinking patient and clinical faculty population, and lounge space. Following that visit, a new hospital was built, clinical faculty and the patient population were increased by 50%, the financial picture was significantly improved, and 1,000 square feet of lounge space was added to Ross Hall. Additional lounge space was provided on the 6th floor of the Hospital, and the courtyard outside Ross Hall was completely renovated. Because a significant minority of students surveyed by the LCME said lounge space was inadequate in 2008, this led to the finding not only that lounge space was presently inadequate, but that this was the second time such a finding had been issued.

A third area of concern to the LCME was a series of unrelated administrative issues. Dean Scott gave two examples, the first concerning the lack of particular language in the School's affiliation agreements with other institutions concerning follow up care for students injured while off the GW campus. Also, on the day of the LCME site visit, the Committee identified a handful of physicians in the Medicine Department at Fairfax Hospital who did not have current faculty appointments. While GW has approximately 2,300 full-time and voluntary faculty, the handful of physicians whose appointments were not current as of that day led to the finding by the LCME.

Dean Scott said that he took the probationary status of the School very seriously, and that he took full responsibility for it as he was the Dean in preparation for the accreditation visit as well as at the time for the visit itself. In order to address the concerns of the LCME, a steering committee in the Medical School has been formed which meets on a daily basis to go over the progress the School is making. President Knapp, Vice Presidents Lehman and Katz, and several others also serve on an oversight committee which meets on a weekly basis with the Medical School leadership about these issues. External and internal consultants in the area of curriculum management have been retained and a second set of consultants familiar with the LCME and its procedures is working with the Medical School administration.

Dean Scott concluded his remarks by saying that the next step is for the SMHS to provide a corrective action plan to the LCME by the beginning of January. That plan is in its final stages and is being developed in conjunction with the secretaries of the LCME. The plan will be considered by the full LCME the first week of February, after which the School will know more about the timetable for the repeat site visit.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Wilmarth moved the election of the following faculty member to Senate Standing Committees: Marvin Center Governing Board: William A. Pucilowsky. The nomination was approved.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Wilmarth presented the Report of the Executive Committee. (The Report is enclosed).

Professor Wilmarth also summarized the findings of a report by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, dated December 12, 2008, entitled "The Appointment of Academic Administrative Officers." That report is included with the Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees, noted below.

III. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Interim Reports were received from the following Standing Committees: Libraries, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, Research, and University and Urban Affairs (the Reports are attached).

IV. CHAIR'S REMARKS

President Knapp announced that the University has selected Dr. Leo Chalupa to serve in the newly created position of Vice President for Research. The selection was made following the recommendation of a very strong faculty search committee led by Professor Vincent Chiappinelli in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. President Knapp noted that Dr. Chalupa comes to GW from the University of California at Davis where he chairs a multidisciplinary department. Dr. Chalupa is a neuroscientist who has worked in psychology, neurophysiology, and ophthalmology. He also has significant experience in research and in developing collaborative programs. Despite his California base, he has a good deal of experience here in Washington. President Knapp added that he thought that Dr. Chalupa, who will arrive in April, will be a very important member of his cabinet moving forward.

President Knapp noted the air of anticipation here in Washington as the date of the Presidential Inauguration approaches. While estimates of the number of people cannot be ascertained with certainty, even the lower estimates of the size of the crowd raises logistical questions for the University due to its proximity to the Foggy Bottom Metro station. Large numbers of people will be pouring out of that station and making their way through the campus. GW has established a task force to bring together the various parts of the University who have an interest in this matter, from student housing to dining services, security, and emergency preparedness. The group has been working assiduously for some time, exploring and making contingency plans. Some of these plans are subject to change depending on major factors, such as the weather. There are also policy questions involved, such as whether or not dining facilities will be open to the public and if so, how late. As the University in the nation's capital, GW wants to be hospitable and present a welcoming face to the nation as it arrives from around the country for the Inaugural events, but safety and the integrity of the campus also must be taken into account.

Among a number of programmatic opportunities under development are GW's Inaugural Ball, which will take place at the Omni Shoreham. Something like 5,000 people, mostly students, have indicated they will attend. Also, this week, after a great deal of effort on the part of GW students, GW was granted permission to have a float in the Inaugural Parade. This has not been done for 60 years, and GW will be the only University in the country which will have such a float in the parade. President Knapp commended the efforts of the students and the faculty who are designing and building the float and said he looked forward to seeing it when it was complete.

President Knapp briefly remarked on his recent trip to Asia, the third time he has been there, visiting Tokyo, Bangkok and Singapore. President Knapp said that, in each country he visited, he encountered a high level of interest in, and, excitement about, the presidential transition in the U.S. This focus on Washington, D.C. may be one of the reasons that GW has received more undergraduate applications this year than last; early decision applications are up 15%. As an institution, the greatest worry going into the new year is whether families will be able to secure the loans and other financial resources they have traditionally relied upon to fund their children's education. The University has written a letter to families of GW students offering assistance in the event a financial situation deteriorates, perhaps because of a loss of employment or for other reasons. The ability of the University to extend such assistance will of course depend upon how long the economic downtown and recession lasts; if the economy rebounds rather quickly, the University should weather the upheaval.

President Knapp concluded by saying it was a pleasant discovery for him to learn that the University's investment policy has been rather conservative compared to other institutions. As noted by Vice President Katz, GW has not borrowed funds for investment purposes. It also has not invested in the Common Fund, which was frozen when the economic crisis occurred; this prevented other institutions from accessing their tuition revenues. GW actually has cash reserves and this should help it maintain a fairly strong position as an institution without resorting to hiring and spending freezes, at least for the foreseeable future.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Griffith asked if any responses had been received to the letter the President mentioned. Vice President Lehman said that as of the day before, 100 responses had been received, and the University is reviewing each of them.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, President Knapp wished everyone happy holidays and a very happy new year. Upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES

INTERIM REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 10, 2008

During the fall semester the Senate Committee on Libraries spent most of its time working on the request from the Executive Committee to consider whether the University should adopt an open access policy for scholarly articles. The Committee developed a draft proposal, which is attached. We were unable to meet with the Senate Committee on Research, but a copy of the draft has been provided to Professor Marotta to share with her committee.

During the spring semester we hope to meet with the Committee on Research to continue our work on this project. If both committees agree on a draft, we anticipate that it will be sent to the Office of General Counsel for comment before it is brought before the Senate.

The Committee also was asked for comments on a proposal from the Senate Educational Policy Committee regarding faculty copyright risks.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott B. Pagel
Director of the Law Library &
Professor of Law

DRAFT

A RESOLUTION ON SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the academic community to have free and unrestricted access to scholarly publications; and

WHEREAS, a concerted effort to deposit faculty publications in university electronic depositories to provide open access to those publications would enable university libraries to combat the spiraling cost of serial publications, thereby making more funds available for the purchase of other materials sought by researchers (see attached appendices for examples of actions taken by other institutions); and

WHEREAS, an increasing number of funding agencies such as the National Institute of Health and the Arts and Humanities Research Council mandate that the results of research be deposited in Open Access archives; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of The George Washington University that the publications of its Faculty be widely disseminated; and

WHEREAS, providing unfettered access to the publications of the Faculty of The George Washington University through the Internet will increase the availability and impact of those publications and enhance the reputation of their authors; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY THAT

1. **Each regular, active-status member of the Faculty of The George Washington University grants to the President and Board of Trustees of the University permission to make available his or her scholarly published writings and to exercise the copyright in those items; and**

2. **The permission granted by each Faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly writings, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that the writings are not sold for profit; and**

3. **The policy will apply to all scholarly publications written while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any items completed**

before the adoption of this policy and any publications for which the Faculty member enters into incompatible licensing or assignment agreements until such time as they are available for distribution; and

4. **The Dean or Dean's designate of each School or College will waive application of this policy or permit an embargo for a period of time specified by the Faculty member for a particular publications upon written request by a Faculty member explaining the need; and**

5. **All publications covered by this resolution will be deposited in the open-access GW Institutional Electronic Repository and its successor entities, for which the Gelman Library presently is responsible; and**

6. **When possible, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of the final version of a publication at no charge to the appropriate representative member of the Repository in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the Repository; and**

7. **When possible, the staff responsible for the GW Institutional Electronic Repository will use their expertise to assist Faculty members with retrieving publications from commercial web sites to place in the Repository and provide funds to do so; and**

8. **The University shall provide such reasonable funding for staff, equipment, and the acquisition of electronic versions of publications as might be necessary for the GW Institutional Electronic Repository to store and make available these materials; and**

9. **The Office of Vice President & General Counsel, while not providing legal advice to faculty members regarding agreements with publishers, shall provide assistance to those faculty members seeking sample agreements that would enable them to publish their works while still retaining public access rights; and**

10. **The Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the Faculty Senate from time to time.**

Revised 11/30/08

APPENDIX A
Harvard Initiative
Adopted February 12, 2008

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, the Faculty adopts the following policy: Each Faculty member grants to the President and Fellows of Harvard College permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles. In legal terms, the permission granted by each Faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. The policy will apply to all scholarly articles written while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. The Dean or the Dean's designate will waive application of the policy for a particular article upon written request by a Faculty member explaining the need.

To assist the University in distributing the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of the final version of the article at no charge to the appropriate representative of the Provost's Office in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office may make the article available to the public in an open-access repository.

The Office of the Dean will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the Faculty from time to time. The policy will be reviewed after three years and a report presented to the Faculty.

(Retrieved from the following site on 11/30/08:
http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~secfas/February_2008_Agenda.pdf)

APPENDIX B
University of California Initiative
(Currently under consideration by the University)

Proposal for UC Faculty – Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy

(Endorsed by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on May 10, 2006)

WHEREAS, in order to facilitate scholarly communication and maximize the impact of the scholarship of UC faculty,[1] the Academic Council's Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) has proposed that the Academic Council consider the following recommended UC copyright policy change:

"A faculty member's ownership of copyright is controlled by the University of California Policy on Ownership of Copyright [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/copyright/]. University of California faculty shall routinely grant to The Regents of the University of California a limited, irrevocable, perpetual, worldwide, non-exclusive[2] license to place in a non-commercial open-access online repository the faculty member's scholarly work published in a scholarly journal or conference proceedings. In the event a faculty member assigns all or a part of his or her copyright rights to a publisher as part of a publication agreement, the faculty member must retain the right to grant this license to the Regents. Faculty may opt out of this requirement for any specific work or invoke a specified delay before such work appears in an open-access repository. Such a license would preserve copyright ownership in the faculty-author, thereby enabling him or her to control subsequent uses of the work."

The Regents will direct the Academic Senate, in collaboration with UC Administration, to establish support and control mechanisms for the use of scholarly work covered by this policy. The University, including assistance, as appropriate, from the Office of the General Counsel, will support faculty in their efforts to retain copyright with attention to maintaining a broad spectrum of publication venues. No income will accrue to the Regents, the University or the Academic Council by this non-exclusive copyright license.

The intent of this policy proposal is clear, but the most appropriate language to accomplish this may need further development.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Academic Council [Academic Assembly] recommends that the President appoint a working group of faculty, administrators and counsel to develop promptly such language, and proposes this change in policy for wide review and ultimately for adoption as soon as feasible.

[1] This proposal follows and implements the intent and specific principles contained in *Responding to the Challenges Facing Scholarly Communication: The Case of Scholars' Management of Their Copyright,* http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/scsc/copyrigh.scsc.0506.pdf

[2] A "non-exclusive" license means that the copyright holder may license others to use the work as well; an "exclusive" license means that the copyright holder may not license others to use the work.

Retrieved from the following site on 11/30/08:
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/may2006/copyright0506.pdf

For additional information on proposal and timeline of actions taken, see:
http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/

APPENDIX C
Selections from

OPEN DOORS AND OPEN MINDS: What faculty authors can do to ensure open access to their work through their institution. Published in April, 2008, by SPARC and Science Commons.

The Internet has brought unparalleled opportunities for expanding availability of research by bringing down economic and physical barriers to sharing. The digitally networked environment promises to democratize access, carry knowledge beyond traditional research niches, accelerate discovery, encourage new and interdisciplinary approaches to ever more complex research challenges, and enable new computational research strategies. However, despite these opportunities for increasing access to knowledge, the prices of scholarly journals have risen sharply over the past two decades, often forcing libraries to cancel subscriptions. Today even the wealthiest institutions cannot afford to sustain all of the journals needed by their faculties and students.

To take advantage of the opportunities created by the Internet and to further their mission of creating, preserving, and disseminating knowledge, many academic institutions are taking steps to capture the benefits of more open research sharing. Colleges and universities have built digital repositories to preserve and distribute faculty scholarly articles and other research outputs. Many individual authors have taken steps to retain the rights they need, under copyright law, to allow their work to be made freely available on the Internet and in their institution's repository. And, faculties at some institutions have adopted resolutions endorsing more open access to scholarly articles.

Most recently, on February 12, 2008, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) at Harvard University took a landmark step. The faculty voted to adopt a policy requiring that faculty authors send an electronic copy of their scholarly articles to the university's digital repository and that faculty authors automatically grant copyright permission to the university to archive and to distribute these articles unless a faculty member has waived the policy for a particular article. Essentially, the faculty voted to make open access to the results of their published journal articles the default policy for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University.

As of March 2008, a proposal is also under consideration in the University of California system by which faculty authors would commit routinely to grant copyright permission to the university to make copies of the faculty's scholarly work openly accessible over the Internet.

.

Harvard's Faculty of Arts and Sciences voted to adopt a policy under which (1) faculty are required to deposit a copy of their scholarly journal articles in an institutional repository and (2) automatically to grant to the University a University License … to

make those articles openly accessible on the Internet. Each of these two components is independently important.

The deposit requirement by itself is valuable because it ensures that the University's collection of Harvard-authored scholarship will grow significantly. Institutions (primarily in Europe) that have adopted similar deposit requirements have experienced high rates of deposit, while those with voluntary policies have had low participation. The deposit requirement is also effective even in the absence of a University License, since a large percentage of journal publishers' copyright agreements already permit authors to post their final manuscript in online institutional archives.

The University License serves three purposes: (1) it covers all the faculty's scholarly articles, including those published in journals that have not to date permitted authors to post articles in their institutional repositories; (2) it standardizes the terms of the Institution's right to host its faculty's work and make it openly accessible; and (3) it grants the Institution the right to make additional copies of articles – for permanent archiving, for example – and to permit others to use the articles so long as the use is not done for profit.

.

Other supporters included Robert Darnton, Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor and Director of the Harvard University Library, who wrote an op-ed piece in the Harvard Crimson, supporting the policy and citing the following reasons for the policy's adoption:

- Promoting openness and free communication of knowledge
- Making scholarship available to the world and sharing intellectual wealth
- Resisting a publishing model that is leading to spiraling prices of journals
- Changing a system that is siphoning resources from library purchases of monographs (and thus adversely affecting library purchasing capacity for them)
- Realigning publishing in a way that favors learning
- Complying with the NIH mandate on public access
- Creating "a republic of letters in which citizenship extends to everyone."

(Retrieved from the following site on 11/30/08:
http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/opendoors_v1.pdf)

Committee Report

on

The Appointment of Academic Administrative Officers

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF)

Chair: Garris, Charles A., Jr., Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Cseh, Maria, Counseling, Human and Organizational Studies
Darr, Kurt J., Health Services Management and Leadership
Kahn, Walter K., Electrical and Computer Engineering
Loew, Murray H., Electrical and Computer Engineering
Robinson, David, Emeritus, Law
Torres, Lisa, Sociology
Watkins, Ryan, Educational Leadership
West, Lynda L., Special Education

ex officio:

Barratt, Marguerite (Peg), Dean, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
Kinder, Robin, Coordinator of Reference Services, Gelman Library
Lawrence, Frederick M., Dean, GW Law School
Sigelman, Carol, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Academic Affairs
Weitzner, Richard, Associate General Counsel
Wilmarth, Arthur E. Jr., Law, Executive Committee Liaison

The Executive Committee in its memorandum of February 4, 2008 (Attachment 1) requested that the PEAF Committee consider the procedures of the Schools with respect to the selection of Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and similar academic officers and to consider the current requirements of the Faculty Code, the By-Laws of the various schools, and to seek counsel of the faculty and deans on the issue. The Executive Committee was prompted to make this request by reports of violations in certain schools of the Faculty Code in making such appointments.

The Faculty Code currently provides a substantial role for the regular-active status Faculty in making such an appointment only for "academic administrative officers." [Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code; C.2.] The reason that the Faculty has such a role is rooted in the principle of shared governance between Faculty and administration as described in Article IX (A) of the Faculty Code where it states that:

> "The regular, active-status faculty shares with the officers of the administration the responsibility for effective operation of the departments and schools of the University as a whole. In the exercise of this responsibility, the regular, active-status faculty plays a role in decisions on the appointment and promotion of members of the faculty and the appointment of the President, deans, department chairs , and other administrative officials with authority over academic matters. The regular active-status faculty also participates

in the formulation of policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education and life at the University. . ."

Thus, unlike operating procedures in hierarchical business or government organizations, the current Faculty Code requires a shared-governance role of regular active-status faculty, and seeks a process where the regular active-status faculty and the administration work in parallel in a collegial and productive manner with mutual respect and who can collaborate effectively as a team in formulating policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education and life at the University. Conversely, there are those that feel that the business or government model is more appropriate and that the Faculty Code should be changed.

The PEAF Committee had three meetings where this was a prominent agenda item. The By-Laws of each of the schools (Attachment # 2) were studied. Professors Wilmarth and Garris met with the Council of Deans to solicit input. Subsequently, the Council of Deans met and discussed the issue at length. They then provided the PEAF committee with its recommendations (Attachment #3). Furthermore, in order to convey these recommendations to the PEAF committee, EVPAA Lehman attended the PEAF meeting of May 2, 2008 to convey and discuss the concerns and recommendations of the deans.

EVPAA Lehman explained that the deans would like to:

a. Directly appoint Associate and Assistant Deans without a faculty committee and without faculty approval of the criteria. The feeling is that these positions are integral members of the dean's team and the dean can best select the individuals whom he/she feels most comfortable working. Further, the feeling of the deans was that the recruitment process would be very much streamlined. The deans felt that the faculty could be consulted after the dean selects the candidate, and the faculty could remove a candidate deemed unacceptable to them through a vote of no-confidence. The deans felt faculty would be more enthusiastic about assuming such roles if they did not have to undergo such scrutiny from their colleagues.

b. The deans felt that Research Professors should not be eligible for appointment in administrative positions since the effort certification required by sponsors becomes unmanageable.

c. The deans felt that individual schools have different needs and the by-laws of each school can determine many of the particulars of the process such as which faculty committee may or not be consulted, who votes in votes of no-confidence, etc.

d. The Council of Deans felt that Assistant Deans should certainly be directly appointed by the deans even if Associate Deans are deemed to require more scrutiny from the faculty.

This valuable perspective from the Council of Deans was carefully considered by the PEAF Committee. The following observations were made by the PEAF Committee:

1. The term "academic administrative officers" as it appears in the Faculty Code [Procedures, C.2.a] should be clarified. There seemed to be consensus that it involved administrators who deal with faculty personnel actions, curricula, research, teaching assignments, faculty development, and the like. There was also a feeling that administrative officers who deal with student recruiting, finance, physical facilities, etc.

do not constitute "academic . . ."

2. The concept that the only faculty input was through a vote of no-confidence was generally rejected. Votes of no-confidence are generally extreme and cast a terrible stigma on the faculty concerned. The feeling was that it was better to head this off by allowing the faculty to offer its recommendations before the appointment is made.
3. There was a feeling that the process required by the Faculty Code is not unwieldy if it is set up in an efficient manner through the respective schools' by-laws. For example, the elected committee can be a standing committee that serves other purposes within the school, such as the Dean's Council in the CCAS. The elected committee can be designated through the by-laws to be the Faculty of the whole, where the "election" takes place pro forma. Similarly, the criteria can be established in advance and approved by the faculty, and subsequently used for many appointments. Thus, the criteria does not have to be developed and voted on each time an appointment is made.
4. There is an advantage in having the administrator endorsed by the faculty prior to assuming the office. While it is in the interest of the dean to have a harmonious team, the functioning of the school should improve if the members of the team have a harmonious relationship with the faculty. Thus , there was a feeling among the PEAF committee that there is benefit from having prior faculty endorsement of candidates. Clearly, the dean can express his/her preferences and the faculty committee would give great weight to this recommendation in their recommendation.
5. The issue of whether or not Assistant deans should be treated differently from Associate Deans was discussed at length. If the Assistant deans do not deal with "academic" issues as discussed above, the Faculty Code does not currently require the dean to follow the process defined in the Faculty Code [Procedures, C.2] . Hence, the dean can appoint them without faculty consultation. However, if the Assistant Dean does deal with "academic" matters, then the feeling was that he/she should not be treated differently from Associate Deans.
6. It was also observed that often lower level administrators are called upon to perform the duties of a higher level administrator. Thus, Assistant Deans may be called upon to do the work normally required by an Associate Dean. Furthermore, if the appointment of Assistant Deans were treated differently than Associate Deans, it is not unlikely that Deans would appoint Assistant Deans to fill positions normally held by Associate Deans in order to evade the faculty scrutiny. This was a substantial argument in favor of not treating the appointment of Assistant Deans differently than Associate Deans.
7. On the concern of the Council of Deans for the appointment of research faculty to administrative positions, there was very little discussion. It was noted that, currently, the Faculty Code does not prohibit such appointments. Further, the concerns of the deans relating to allocation of effort seem sponsor related. Thus while the concern may be very valid in certain instances with certain sponsors, it was not clear that such a prohibition should be included in the Faculty Code.
8. There was concern among PEAF members that changing the Faculty Code should only be done with extreme care when major issues arise. After much discussion, the PEAF committee concluded that there was considerable wisdom in the process currently defined by the Faculty Code, and that there is much flexibility that could be better taken advantage of by the deans.

SUGGESTIONS ON STREAMLINING THE PROCESS

- **Appointment of "academic administrative officers"**
 In accordance with the Faculty Code's references to"academic administrative officer," it would be helpful if in accordance with the administrative structure of each school, the by-laws specifically state which appointments are academic and which are not. Such clarification would enable the dean to make appropriate appointments of non-academic officers without concern for the need for faculty consultation. It would also clarify the role of each administrator.

- "**Appointments to such positions shall be made only after a special or standing committee, elected by the regular, active-status faculty involved from among the faculty's tenured members . . . considered nominations, and reported its recommendations in accordance with the procedures established under Section A, above to the faculty that elected it or to the appropriate academic administrative officer.**"
 The By-Laws of the school can authorize a standing committee to perform the functions of the Associate Dean and Assistant Dean search committee. Some schools have a standing "Dean's Council Committee" or the like which, if it is composed of tenured faculty, can be empowered through the by-laws to perform this function. If the committee is composed of both tenured and non-tenured faculty, the by-laws can empower only the tenured members to perform this function. Similarly, if the Faculty of the respective School wish the process to be more inclusive so as to allow non-tenured faculty, research faculty, students, etc. to participate in the process, provisions defining their roles can also be included in the by-laws. The issue of conducting an actual election can be avoided by designating the "Faculty of the whole" as the appropriate committee, and the election is pro forma. Such statements in the school by-laws can avoid the need to conduct an election and to convene a special committee, and is completely consistent with the Faculty Code. The by-laws could also specify who the committee should make its recommendations to.

- "**. . . has established criteria (subject to the approval of that faculty as a whole**
 For Associate and Assistant Dean positions, the criteria for selection can be established, approved by the faculty, maintained as standing criteria until such time as the faculty vote to amend them. The by-laws of the school should so specify that the criteria for a specific position, which was voted on by the faculty as a whole at the last convened faculty meeting, remain in effect until amended at a full school-wide faculty meeting.

- **"The academic administrative officers . . . shall be qualified for faculty membership by training and experience."**
 This requirement does not limit the appointment of "academic" Associate and Assistant Deans to members of the faculty. It is recognized that many of these administrative positions may be better managed by skilled and experienced administrators rather than scholars. Conversely, extracting a productive scholar and teacher from an enriching academic career to pursue operational and administrative exigencies may not be in the best interest of the University. Thus, academic administrative officers need only be qualified for faculty membership by training or experience. It not necessarily require that

the person meet the requirements for tenure or appointment at a specific faculty grade. These requirements, however, can be included in the "criteria" if the respective faculty consider them to be important. Similarly, the Council of Deans suggested that Research Faculty be barred from appointments as "academic administrative officers" because of various difficulties that may arise. Such a bar does not exist in the Faculty Code. However, such bars can be implemented in the respective school by-laws if the faculty so decide.

- "**such appointees shall hold office only as long as they retain the confidence of the faculty concerned.**"
 The PEAF Committee considers the current procedures in this regard which are outlined in Article C.2.c) of PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FACULTY CODE. However, expanding on these procedures in the by-laws of the respective school may be advantageous.

In conclusion, the PEAF Committee recommends that the current procedures for the Appointment of Associate and Assistant Deans in the Faculty Code remain unchanged. We believe changes can be made to school bylaws, as described above, in order to streamline the procedures of appointing academic administrative officers within the Schools.

Respectfully Submitted

Faculty Senate Committee of Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
December 12, 2008

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON DC

FACULTY SENATE

Memorandum

February 4, 2008

TO: Professor Charles A. Garris, Jr., Chair
Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

FROM: Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

The Executive Committee would appreciate having the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom examine the By-laws and procedures of the schools with respect to the selection of Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and similar academic officers.

Although the Faculty Code addresses these positions and provides for the selection process , the practices that some schools have followed are at variance with the Code. It is the view of the Executive Committee that we need to address this issue. To that end, we are asking for a review by your Committee of the appropriate documents and practices and your recommendations, as appropriate.

Many thanks for your consideration of this matter.

WASHINGTON, DC 20052
202-994-7198 • FAX 202-994-1523 • WEB www.gwu.edu/~facsen

A Recommendation to the Faculty Senate
Concerning the Appointment of Associate and Assistant Deans

The Faculty Code outlines the procedures for appointing associate and assistant deans (page 20, Sec. C2). While useful, these procedures do not always serve the best interests of the schools and the deans and moreover can be streamlined. It has been noted, for example, that appointing only regular, active-status faculty to these posts may serve to reduce the level of scholarly activity in a school. In addition, as each school may have its own particular needs and concerns regarding these administrative positions, it is not in GW's best interest to require all schools to follow the exactly the same procedures.

The deans therefore respectfully suggest that the following general guidelines and procedures be adopted beginning FY 2010 for appointing associate and assistant deans:

1) Deans be empowered to select appropriate faculty members to assist them in their duties by serving as associate deans. Deans may choose to appoint non-faculty to assistant dean positions.

2) In appointing associate deans, Deans will solicit input from their regular, active-status faculty members in a manner consistent with the school's operating principles.

3) Research faculty members will not be appointed as associate deans. Research faculty members may, when appropriate to a school's mission and approved by a majority of the regular, active-status faculty members, serve as assistant deans.

4) Each school shall put in place procedures for reviewing associate and assistant dean appointments in instances in which a majority of the regular, active-status faculty has lost confidence in an appointee.

Senate Committee on Research
Interim Report to the Faculty Senate
December 12, 2008

The Senate Committee on Research (SCR) met three times during the fall 2008 semester. The following items were addressed:

Joint Meeting of Senate Committee on Research (SCR) and the Advisory Council for Research (ACR) had a joint meeting on September 19th, 2008. The agenda included 'lessons learned' from the search for the new Vice-President for Research position at GW. VP Sigelman presented an update on indirect costs for FY08.

Open Access Policy for Faculty Publications

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged the SCR with a review of the possibility of adopting an open-access policy for scholarly articles published by the faculty. The Senate Library Committee was also charged with this review, and the two committees have been working together. The SCR researched other universities which either have such policies in place, or are in the process of adopting such a policy, during two regular meetings (September 26th and October 24th). An electronic review of the Library Committees proposal for a policy is currently underway. Further review and a decision whether to present a resolution to the full senate are expected during spring 2009.

Sylvia A. Marotta, Chair

MID YEAR Report of the Faculty Senate Standing Committee on University and Urban Affairs (UAUA)
December 4, 2008

Co-Chairs: Assistant Professor Christy Zink (czink@gwu.edu) and Associate Professor Lisa Benton-Short (lbenton@gwu.edu)

To date, the University and Urban Affairs Committee (UAUA) has met twice this year (October and November). The Co-Chairs, Christy Zink and Lisa Benton-Short also met in September to discuss priorities for the Committee for 2008-2009.

The UAUA helps foster continued good citizenship between the George Washington University and the greater Washington, DC metropolitan area. The UAUA Committee itself represents the breadth and strength of the University community, with active faculty, administrators, staff, and student members serving in full member or ex-officio status, from schools and departments across campus.

In 2008-2009, the UAUA Committee will concentrate its work in four areas:

- Programming the St. Mary's Court Speakers Series,
- Encouraging GW's sustainability initiatives,
- Supporting faculty service, service-learning, and community research projects
- Collaborating on community building in the Foggy Bottom, DC metropolitan area, and global learning communities.

St. Mary's Court Speakers Series

The St. Mary's Court Speakers Series is a community education program that creates dialogues between GW faculty and members of the urban community on matters of current, active research. The talks--a central project initiated and managed by the UAUA Committee--are held off campus at St. Mary's Court, a senior residential complex. Staff members of the residential complex, members of the UAUA committee, GW faculty and students, and Foggy Bottom community members are also attend. The Series is held in conjunction with Iona Senior Services with a subsidized lunch program available to all seniors living in Foggy Bottom/West End.

This year's program plans for nine events over the course of the school year. The first two events have been scheduled: Sharon Hamilton of the University Writing Program will have given a talk on October 15 titled, "All That for a Kiss? Poetry Appreciation and Shelley's 'Love's Philosophy,'" and Mona Atia of the Geography Department spoke on October 24 on the social, economic, and political policies of Islam. The Speakers Series takes place at 1:00 PM. Additional events, including committed speakers from the Doctor of Physical Therapy program and the Physical Assistants Program, are currently being scheduled. We also have a speaker scheduled for early December.

GW Sustainability

A meeting of the UAUA Committee in March 2007 resulted in identifying key roles for the UAUA committee for the following year, key among them issues of sustainability and the support of faculty service and service-learning projects.

The University's Academic Sustainability Implementation Working Group currently includes UAUA member Lisa Benton-Short. An initial recommendation being considered by that committee is the creation of a GW Sustainability Research Institute, which would allow faculty and students to collaborate on research and teaching and to network with various community partners. This would be the academic complement to the newly created Office of Sustainability. The UAUA Committee will explore ways to encourage Sustainability initiatives across campus and through faculty, particularly focusing on initiatives that would allow for faculty, student, and community collaborations.

Supporting Faculty Service, Service-Learning Projects, and Community Research

The priority that emerged from the March UAUA brainstorming session is to enhance service and the role and appreciation of faculty who integrate service-learning and community outreach in their research or teaching. Given President Knapp's commitment to developing GW as a premiere urban research university, the UAUA Committee supports efforts to capture and make available information on current projects that link research and service together through existing and developing partnerships inside and outside the classroom.

The UAUA Committee has two members, Lisa Benton-Short and Emily Morrison, currently serving on the President's Service Implementation Committee. This committee has been convened this fall to provide recommendations for the implementation of several items related to service that came out of a report given to President Knapp in Spring 2008. It has met three times to date. Two items of concern to the UAUA that are under discussion by the committee include: 1) designating a class with service-learning component on the transcript, in the same way the university currently designates a Writing in the Disciplines course (WID), and 2) a service database and mapping project. This project was initiated as part of President Knapp's inauguration, and preliminary feedback suggested the university continue this annually. White papers on how to implement these projects were submitted to the Board of Trustees in October 2008.

The University can increase and enhance the role of service by creating a comprehensive, centralized database that reflects the rich variety of service among GW faculty. Such a database would provide solid value to the university through increased opportunities for faculty to coordinate efforts with shared community partners; for faculty interested in cross-disciplinary collaborative work within the university; for students seeking service opportunities in their majors and schools; and for the university to better understand, represent, and promote the breadth and depth of faculty and staff service efforts. Mapping the database will assist the university in recognizing where and what types of

outreach efforts are occurring in the local community, region, nation and world, as well as showing where gaps and unaddressed possibilities exist. The UAUA awaits the final Service Brainstorming Committee report.

Collaboration on Community Building

The UAUA committee has a proven commitment to supporting existing partnerships between the university and its neighbors, through support of programs such as FRIENDS events and the community building work of the Office of Government, International, and Community Relations. Members of the UAUA will continue this tradition by attending events and working meetings held throughout the school year, including the upcoming Oct. 19 Foggy Bottom/West End Neighborhood Block Party sponsored by the FRIENDS community group.

Community building support connects immediately with this years' assigned matters from the Faculty Senate to continue planning and support of programs that bring together University faculty and administrators with DC government leaders, citizen groups, and members of the Foggy Bottom community. Community building efforts will also be realized by following the additional charge of expanding opportunities for service projects and community outreach, recognizing that such opportunities can simultaneously strengthen local and larger communities, given the international outreach work of some GW faculty.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
December 14, 2007

On behalf of the Executive Committee I have the following to report:

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review:

The charge to the University Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review, co-chaired by Dean Barratt and Professor Gary Simon, has been prepared and forwarded to the Co-Chairs and the Committee members representing the five schools with responsibility for undergraduate education.

The charge contains the expectation that the Steering Committee will be providing periodic reports on its work.

Budget Overview:

At the invitation of the Executive Committee, Professor Joseph Cordes, Chair of the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, provided an overview on the FY 2008 operating and capital budgets, including a summary of budget projections.

Decanal Requests for Additional Outside Reviews in Tenure and Promotion Considerations:

The Executive Committee has continued its discussions in response to the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee's request that the Senate review tenure and promotion review policies and procedures with a focus on the rigor of such reviews. These discussions have also been ongoing in the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom.

One focus has been on the issue of the final decision with respect to unresolved administration nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations. In the current system the nonconcurrence is forwarded either to the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs or the President. The alternative discussed has been that the final disposition be determined by an elected Committee of faculty.

The most recent discussion has been on the matter of possible decanal requests for additional outside reviews of scholarship in general and specifically their desirability, potential function and timing.

Dispute Resolution Committee:

The Executive Committee has appointed Professor Leo Moersen, School of Business as an alternate temporary member on the Dispute Resolution Committee.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances:

Meditation efforts with respect to the grievance in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences have been unsuccessful. Accordingly, this case will now proceed to hearing.

The Chair of the Dispute Resolution Committee has reported receipt of a grievance in Columbian College.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Committee on Faculty Development, including Academic and Administrative Support:

The Executive Committee has requested that the Committee on Faculty Development, including Academic and Administrative Support, consider the current level of engagement with the University by emeriti faculty and the potential for mutually beneficial expanded involvement.

The Committee will also be receiving a request that it examine the type and level of administrative and technical support provided to faculty members by their schools.

Committee on Physical Facilities:

The Physical Facilities Committee has been asked to examine existing policies and practices with respect to faculty members scheduling classroom space for special needs such as examination reviews, make- up examinations, and additional class meetings.

UPCOMING MATTERS

The Executive Committee is in the process of scheduling the following:

-annual report on the composition of the faculty
-biennial report on women and faculty of color
-emergency preparedness

NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for December 21. Resolutions, reports, and any other matters should be submitted before that date.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I extend warmest wishes for the holidays and the new year!

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

December 3, 2008

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, December 12, 2008, at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7th Floor

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of November 14, 2008, as distributed

3. Introduction of Resolutions

4. Responses by Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis H. Katz to questions related to the following two reports, which were presented at the Faculty Senate's meeting on November 14, 2008: (1) the Report prepared by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee on the University's Operating and Capital Budgets and the potential impact of the Science and Engineering Complex on those budgets, and (2) the Progress Report on the Science and Engineering Complex, prepared by the Special Committee on Financial and Operational Planning for the Science and Engineering Complex

5. Report by Vice President for Health Affairs John F. Williams on the reaccreditation of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences

6. General Business:

 (a) Nomination for appointment by the President to Administrative Committees: Marvin Center Governing Board: Professor William A. Pucilowsky

 (b) Report of the Executive Committee

 (c) Interim Reports of Standing Committees

 (d) Chair's Remarks

7. Brief Statements (and Questions)

8. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary